

Exact algorithms for OWA-optimization in multiobjective spanning tree problems

Lucie Galand^a, Olivier Spanjaard^{*a}

^aLIP6-CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie (UPMC), 104 Avenue du Président Kennedy, F-75016 Paris, France

Abstract

This paper deals with the multiobjective version of the optimal spanning tree problem. More precisely, we are interested in determining the optimal spanning tree according to an *Ordered Weighted Average* (OWA) of its objective values. We first show that the problem is weakly NP-hard. In the case where the weights of the OWA are strictly decreasing, we then propose a mixed integer programming formulation, and provide dedicated optimality conditions yielding an important reduction of the size of the program. Next, we present two bounds that can be used to prune subspaces of solutions either in a shaving phase or in a branch and bound procedure. The validity of these bounds does not depend on specific properties of the weights (apart from non-negativity). All these exact resolution algorithms are compared on the basis of numerical experiments, according to their respective validity scopes.

Key words: Multiobjective spanning tree problem, ordered weighted average, MIP formulation, optimality conditions, branch and bound

1. Introduction

Multiobjective combinatorial optimization deals with problems involving multiple viewpoints [4]. More formally, the valuation structure of such problems is made of vectors (each component representing a specific viewpoint) instead of scalars. All popular single objective optimization problems (e.g., valued graph problems, integer linear programming...) can be recasted in this setting, and solution algorithms must be proposed. Two types of approaches can be studied: either one looks for a best compromise solution according to a given aggregation function (e.g., max operator, Chebyshev's norm to a reference vector [40], ordered weighted average [41], Choquet integral [12]), or one aims at generating the whole set of Pareto-optimal solutions (i.e., solutions that cannot be improved on one objective without being depreciated on another one). Computing this set (also called the Pareto set) is natural when no preferential information is available or when the available information is insufficient to elicit the parameters of the aggregation function: the solutions in the Pareto set are indeed the only ones likely to be selected by any rational decision maker. The interest in this approach has spawned a substantial literature (for a survey on the topic, the reader can refer to several quite recent papers [5, 6]). However, the number of Pareto-optimal solutions can grow exponentially with the size of the instance [e.g. 14, 15] and the number of objectives [31]. The examination of the whole set of Pareto-optimal solutions can therefore become quickly awkward. Furthermore, focusing on one particular compromise solution makes it possible to considerably speed up the resolution procedure. Consequently, for practicality and efficiency reasons, the search for a best compromise solution seems to be a better approach when an aggregation function is available. This is the approach we study in this paper.

More precisely, we investigate here the multiobjective version of the optimal spanning tree problem. This problem arises naturally in various contexts. For example, consider a broadcasting network where the values of the edges represent bandwidths. Assuming that the bandwidth of a chain equals the minimum bandwidth over its edges, it is well-known that, in a maximal spanning tree, the bandwidth between two nodes is the maximum possible. When there

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: lucie.galand@lip6.fr (Lucie Galand), olivier.spanjaard@lip6.fr (Olivier Spanjaard)

are several scenarios of traffic (impacting the values of the bandwidths) or several opinions of experts on the values of the bandwidths, the problem becomes multiobjective. Previous works on the subject mainly deal with generating the whole Pareto set in the biobjective case [3, 14, 35, 36], or computing a min-max (regret) optimal solution when there are more than two objectives [2, 14, 19, 39, 44]. To our knowledge, there is therefore no operational algorithmic tool for this problem when there are more than two objectives and when the min-max (regret) criterion is not really suitable. The present paper precisely aims at tackling this gap, by providing algorithms able to optimize a less conservative decision criterion for any number of objectives. Provided the required preferential information is available, and provided the objectives are commensurate (which is the case in the above example for instance), we propose to resort to an averaging operator to compare the vectorial values of the feasible solutions (spanning trees). According to the decision context, one may however want to put the emphasis on the best, the worst or the median evaluations of a solution. In other words, one needs to assign importance weights not to specific objectives (scenarios, experts), but rather to best and worst evaluations. The *Ordered Weighted Average* (OWA) precisely enables to model such concern. For this reason, we focus here on the *OWA-optimal spanning tree problem*, i.e. finding the optimal spanning tree according to OWA in a multiobjective spanning tree problem. In the case of strictly decreasing weights (favouring well-balanced solutions), the use of an OWA objective function has been studied by Ogryczak and Sliwinski [24, 25] in continuous optimization under linear constraints, and by Galand and Spanjaard [11] in multiobjective heuristic search. In this paper, we propose new algorithms specifically dedicated to the optimization of OWA in multiobjective spanning tree problems, some of which are able to handle not only strictly decreasing weights but also every other types of weights.

The paper is organized as follows. After recalling some preliminary definitions and stating the problem, we give some insights into computational complexity (Section 2). Then, we provide a mixed integer programming formulation of the problem, as well as a preprocessing procedure based on optimality conditions for the OWA-optimal spanning tree problem (Section 3). We then propose two – efficiently computable – alternative bounds for discarding subspaces of solutions in either a branch and bound or a shaving procedure (Section 4). Finally, we provide numerical experiments to assess the operability of the proposed methods (Section 5).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Multiobjective compromise search problem

A *multiobjective compromise search problem* is a problem endowed with vectorial costs where one searches for a best compromise solution according to a given aggregation function. A generic multiobjective compromise search problem can be formulated as a mathematical program. We now introduce some notations for this purpose. We denote by $X \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ the set of feasible solutions, $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ a vector valued function on X , and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a multiobjective aggregation function. Within this setting, a multiobjective compromise search problem is written as follows:

$$(P) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \varphi(y) \\ \text{s.t.} & y = f(x) \\ & x \in X \end{cases}$$

Denoting by $Y = f(X) = \{f(x) : x \in X\}$ the *image set* of X in the *objective space* $\mathbb{R}^p$, problem P can be simply reformulated as $\min_{y \in Y} \varphi(y)$. The OWA-optimal spanning tree problem obviously belongs to this class of problems. The resolution methods we propose hereafter for this problem are actually quite generic. The mathematical formulations of P will therefore be convenient to describe these methods in the sequel. We now more specifically introduce the OWA operator and then the OWA-optimal spanning tree problem.

2.2. The OWA operator

Given a set $\{1, \dots, p\}$ of objectives (to minimize), one can associate a vector in $\mathbb{N}^p$ to every feasible solution of a multiobjective problem. The comparison of solutions amounts then to comparing the corresponding vectors. Following several works in multiobjective optimization [e.g. 23, 27, 28], we propose to compare the vectors on the basis of their OWA value [41] (to minimize), defined as follows:

Definition 1. Given a vector y in $\mathbb{R}^p$, its ordered weighted average is $OWA(y) = \sum_{i=1}^p w_i y_{(i)}$, where $\sum_{i=1}^p w_i = 1$ and $y_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq y_{(p)}$ are the components of y sorted in non-increasing order.

According to the decisional context, one can distinguish within the class of OWA operators two interesting subclasses depending on the definition of the weights:

- *strictly decreasing weights*, i.e. $w_1 > \dots > w_p > 0$: the set of weights naturally belongs to this class when performing robust discrete optimization. In *robust optimization* [19], the cost of a solution depend on different possible scenarios (states of the world). The aim is to find a *robust solution* according to this multiobjective representation, i.e. a solution that remains suitable whatever scenario finally occurs. The use of the OWA criterion in this setting is justified since it can be characterized by a set of axioms that are natural for modelling robustness [27]. More precisely, these axioms characterize an OWA criterion with strictly positive and strictly decreasing weights. Compared to the max criterion frequently used in robustness, the OWA criterion is less conservative since it enables trade-offs between several scenarios. Note however that the OWA criterion includes the max criterion as a special case, when one sets $w_1 = 1 - \sum_{i=2}^p \varepsilon_i$, $w_2 = \varepsilon_2, \dots, w_p = \varepsilon_p$ with $\varepsilon_2 > \dots > \varepsilon_p > 0$ and ε_2 tends towards 0. Another interesting special case is obtained for “big-stepped weights”, i.e. when the gaps between successive weights are huge ($w_1 \gg \dots \gg w_p$). The OWA criterion reduces then to the leximax operator, which consists in comparing two vectors on the basis of their greatest component, their second greatest one in case of equality on the first one, and so on... This criterion refines thus the max criterion by discriminating between vectors with the same value on the greatest component.
- *non-monotonic weights*: one of the most famous decision criterion in decision under complete uncertainty (i.e., when several states of the world can occur, and no information is available about their plausibilities) is Hurwicz’s criterion, that enables to model intermediate attitudes towards uncertainty (i.e., neither desperately pessimistic nor outrageously optimistic) by performing a linear combination of the maximum possible value of a solution under the different scenarios, and the minimum possible one. More formally, if y is the image of a solution in the objective space, then its value according to Hurwicz’s criterion is: $\alpha \max_i y_i + (1 - \alpha) \min_i y_i$. Hurwicz’s criterion clearly is a special case of the OWA criterion, obtained by setting $w_1 = \alpha$, $w_p = 1 - \alpha$ and $w_i = 0 \ \forall i \neq 1, p$. As soon as there are more than two scenarios and $\alpha \notin \{0, 1\}$, these sets of weights are neither non-increasing nor non-decreasing. Another natural decision context where the sequence of weights is non-monotonic happens when every component represents the opinion of a particular expert, and one wants to dismiss the extreme opinions. For instance, one can set $w_1 = 0$, $w_p = 0$ and $w_i = 1/(p - 2) \ \forall i \neq 1, p$.

2.3. Problem and complexity

The problem we study in this paper is the OWA-optimal spanning tree problem, that can be formulated as follows:

OWA-OPTIMAL SPANNING TREE PROBLEM (OWA-ST)

Input: a finite connected graph $G = (V, E)$, p integer valuations v_i^e for every edge $e \in E$ ($i = 1, \dots, p$), and a set of weights w_i ($i = 1, \dots, p$) for the OWA criterion;

Goal: we want to determine a spanning tree $T^* \in \arg \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}} OWA(f(T))$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of spanning trees in G and $f(T) = (\sum_{e \in T} v_1^e, \dots, \sum_{e \in T} v_p^e)$.

Coming back to generic formulation P of a multiobjective compromise search problem, problem OWA-ST corresponds to the following specifications: a spanning tree T is characterized by a vector $x = (x^1, \dots, x^m) \in X$ where $x^j = 1$ when edge e^j belongs to T , and its cost is $f(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_p(x))$ where $f_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m v_i^j x^j$. The aggregation function is of course defined by $\varphi(y) = OWA(y)$. We now introduce a small instance of problem OWA-ST that will be used as a running example in the sequel of the paper.

Example 1. Consider a clique G with 4 vertices, and assume that the edges have been evaluated according to 3 objectives (scenarios, experts...). The set of vertices is $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and the valuations of the edges are the following: $v^{[1,2]} = (3, 2, 3)$, $v^{[1,3]} = (4, 3, 1)$, $v^{[1,4]} = (1, 2, 2)$, $v^{[2,3]} = (2, 4, 1)$, $v^{[2,4]} = (2, 6, 1)$, $v^{[3,4]} = (1, 5, 1)$. A minimum spanning tree is $T_1 = \{[1, 4], [2, 3], [3, 4]\}$ according to the first dimension and the arithmetic mean, $T_2 = \{[1, 2], [1, 3], [1, 4]\}$ according to the second dimension, and $T_3 = \{[1, 3], [2, 3], [3, 4]\}$ according to the third dimension. None of them is however completely satisfying: either it is too much unbalanced ($f(T_1) = (4, 11, 4)$ and

$f(T_3) = (7, 12, 3)$), or it is too much conservative ($f(T_2) = (8, 7, 6)$). Spanning tree $T_4 = \{[1, 2], [1, 4], [2, 3]\}$ (with $f(T_4) = (6, 8, 6)$) presents none of the drawbacks of the previous trees, and is OWA-optimal when setting for instance $w_1 = 0.5$, $w_2 = 0.3$ and $w_3 = 0.2$. The overall ranking according to OWA on $T_1, \dots, T_4$ is indeed: 1) T_4 with $\text{OWA}(6, 8, 6) = 7$, 2) T_2 with $\text{OWA}(8, 7, 6) = 7.3$, 3) T_1 with $\text{OWA}(4, 11, 4) = 7.5$, 4) T_3 with $\text{OWA}(7, 12, 3) = 8.7$.

As already indicated above, when $w_1 = 1$ and all other weights w_i 's are equal to zero, the OWA criterion reduces to the max criterion. In this case, it has been proved that computing a min-max spanning tree is NP-hard [14, 44]. Consequently, problem OWA-ST is also NP-hard in the general case. Note however that it is polynomially solvable for some subclasses of instances:

- when $w_1 = w_2 = \dots = w_p$ (arithmetic mean), an optimal solution can be obtained by valuing every edge e by $\sum_{i=1}^p v_i^e$, and then applying a standard minimum spanning tree algorithm (e.g. Prim's algorithm or Kruskal's algorithm);
- when $w_p = 1$ and $w_i = 0 \ \forall i \neq p$ (min criterion), an optimal solution can be obtained by solving p standard minimum spanning tree problems (one for each objective) and then returning the optimal one among them according to OWA;
- when there exists a permutation π of objectives such that $v_{\pi(1)}^e \geq \dots \geq v_{\pi(p)}^e$ for every edge e , an optimal solution can be obtained by valuing every edge e by $\sum_{i=1}^p w_i v_{\pi(i)}^e$, and then applying a standard minimum spanning tree algorithm.

Note that these types of polynomial instances are quite uncommon. Nevertheless, one can design a *Fully Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme* (FPTAS) that works for any instance of OWA-ST. For this purpose, following Aissi et al. [1], one can enrich the existing FPTAS for the determination of an approximate Pareto set in the multiobjective spanning tree problem [26]. This algorithm indeed returns a set $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$ of spanning trees, the cardinality of which is polynomial in the size of the instance. For every spanning tree T in the graph, there exists $T_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$ such that $f_i(T_\varepsilon) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)f_i(T)$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Note that $[y_i \leq y'_i \ \forall i] \Rightarrow \text{OWA}(y) \leq \text{OWA}(y')$ [7], and that $\text{OWA}((1 + \varepsilon)y) = (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OWA}(y)$. Thus, a spanning tree T_ε^* which is OWA-optimal among the trees of $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$ satisfies $\text{OWA}(f(T_\varepsilon^*)) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{OWA}(f(T^*))$, where T^* is an OWA-optimal spanning tree in $\mathcal{T}$. We have therefore an FPTAS for problem OWA-ST (the algorithm is indeed polynomial since the search for T_ε^* is performed in a set of polynomial cardinality). The impact of this result is however mainly theoretical, due to the high computational complexity of the polynomial time procedure proposed by Papadimitriou and Yannakakis to compute an approximate Pareto set [26]. For this reason, we provide in the following more operational *exact* algorithms (the complexity of which is exponential in the worst case) for problem OWA-ST. The validity of the proposed algorithms depends on the subclass of weights used in the OWA criterion: strictly decreasing or arbitrary (including the case of non-monotonic weights).

3. Resolution method for strictly decreasing weights

The strict decreasingness of the weights implies the convexity of the OWA function. It is well-known that convexity of the objective function is a nice property in minimization problems. In particular, this property makes it possible to linearize objective function $\varphi = \text{OWA}$ in mathematical programming formulation P of Section 2, so as to get a mixed integer programming formulation of problem OWA-ST. This is the topic of the following subsection.

3.1. MIP formulation

In the way of Yaman et al. [43] for the robust spanning tree problem with interval data, we start from a compact mixed integer programming (MIP) formulation of the minimum spanning tree problem proposed by Magnanti and Wolsey [20]. In this formulation the minimum spanning tree problem is considered as a special version of a flow problem. Every edge $e = [i, j]$ is replaced by two opposite arcs (i, j) and (j, i) . The set of such arcs is denoted by A in the sequel. Some vertex of the graph — say 1 — is selected as a source, and $n - 1$ units of flow are incoming into it (where $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$). Furthermore, 1 unit of flow is outgoing of every vertex $i \neq 1$. To each feasible flow in the directed graph, one can associate a connected partial graph by selecting edge $e = [i, j]$ as soon as there is at least one unit of flow on (i, j) or (j, i) . By imposing that the number of selected edges is $n - 1$, one obtains a spanning tree. Let

φ_{ij} denote the flow on arc (i, j) , x^e denote the boolean variable taking value 1 if $\varphi_{ij} > 0$ or $\varphi_{ji} > 0$ (for $e = [i, j]$), and v^e denote the scalar value of edge e . The corresponding MIP formulation of the minimum spanning tree problem is:

$$(P_{\text{MST}}) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min \sum_{e \in E} v^e x^e \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \varphi_{ij} - \sum_{(j,i) \in A} \varphi_{ji} = \begin{cases} n-1 & \text{if } i = 1, \\ -1 & \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \end{cases} \\ \\ \varphi_{ij} \leq (n-1)x^e \quad \forall e = [i, j], \\ \varphi_{ji} \leq (n-1)x^e \quad \forall e = [i, j], \\ \\ \sum_{e \in E} x^e = 1, \\ \varphi \geq 0, x^e \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall e \in E. \end{array} \right.$$

We modify and enrich this MIP formulation in order to take into account the multiobjective aspect of OWA-ST, as well as the OWA aggregation function. The multiobjective aspect can be modelled by simply adding constraints $y_i = \sum_{e \in E} v_i^e x^e \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ into P_{MST} , where y_i is the variable corresponding to the value of the spanning tree on the i^{th} component. The objective function is then $\text{OWA}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^p w_i y_{(i)}$, yielding a new program denoted by P_{OWA} . Nevertheless, in this formulation, this program is not linear. A nice linearization of the objective function has been proposed by Ogryczak and Sliwinski [25]. The key idea is to use the Lorenz vector of y , the i^{th} component of which is defined, in a minimization setting, by $L_i(y) = \sum_{j=1}^i y_{(j)}$. This notion has been introduced in economics for inequality comparisons (in a maximization setting), where y is seen as an income distribution [e.g. 22]. By noting that $\text{OWA}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^p (w_i - w_{i+1}) L_i(y)$, where $w_{p+1} = 0$, it appears that function OWA is linear in the components of the Lorenz vector. Furthermore, component $L_i(y)$ is the solution of linear program P_i^y defined below. However, when y is a variable, program P_i^y is no more linear. To overcome this difficulty, it is worth considering the dual version D_i^y , where d_j^i (resp. r_i) are the dual variables for the inequality (resp. equality) constraints:

$$(P_i^y) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \max \quad \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j^i y_j \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j^i = i, \\ 0 \leq \alpha_j^i \leq 1 \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\}. \end{array} \right. \quad (D_i^y) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min \quad ir_i + \sum_{j=1}^p d_j^i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad r_i + d_j^i \geq y_j \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \\ d_j^i \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\}. \end{array} \right.$$

Replacing $L_i(y)$ by program D_i^y for $i = 1, \dots, p$, program P_{OWA} becomes:

$$(P_{\text{OWA}}) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min \quad \sum_{i=1}^p (w_i - w_{i+1}) (ir_i + \sum_{j=1}^p d_j^i) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad r_i + d_j^i \geq y_j \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \\ y_i = \sum_{e \in E} v_i^e x^e \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \\ \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \varphi_{ij} - \sum_{(j,i) \in A} \varphi_{ji} = \begin{cases} n-1 & \text{if } i = 1, \\ -1 & \forall i \in V \setminus \{1\}, \end{cases} \\ \\ \varphi_{ij} \leq (n-1)x^e \quad \forall e = [i, j], \\ \varphi_{ji} \leq (n-1)x^e \quad \forall e = [i, j], \\ \\ \sum_{e \in E} x^e = 1, \\ d_j^i \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \text{ and } r_i \text{ unrestricted}, \\ \varphi \geq 0, x^e \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall e \in E. \end{array} \right.$$

Note that this formulation is valid only when $w_i - w_{i+1} > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$, which is the case here since the w_i 's are assumed to be strictly decreasing. With m edges in the graph, the program involves $p^2 + n + 2m + 1$ constraints and $p^2 + p + 3m$ variables (variables y_i 's can be omitted in the implementation): its size is therefore linear in the size of

the input for a fixed number of objectives. In order to further reduce the number of variables and constraints involved in P_{OWA} , we now provide a preprocessing method that enables to reduce the density of the graph.

3.2. Preprocessing of the graph

As often done when presenting algorithms for constructing spanning trees [e.g. 37], we describe our preprocessing phase as an edge coloring process. Initially all edges are uncolored. We color one edge at a time either blue (mandatory) or red (forbidden). At each step of the preprocessing phase, we have therefore a partial coloring $c(\cdot)$ of the edges of G . For a partial coloring c , we denote by $\mathcal{T}(c)$ the set of trees including all blue edges, some of the uncolored ones (possibly none), and none of the red ones. The aim of the preprocessing phase is to color as many edges as possible, so as to get a maximal coloring c such that $\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(c)} \text{OWA}(f(T)) = \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \text{OWA}(f(T))$. We now give conditions under which an edge can be colored blue or red, which are adaptations of the well-known *cut optimality condition* and *cycle optimality condition* to our problem.

Before introducing the optimality conditions, we recall some definitions from graph theory. A *cut* in a graph is a partition of the vertices into two disjoint sets and a *crossing edge* (with respect to a cut) is one edge that connects a vertex in one set to a vertex in the other one. When there is no ambiguity, the term *cut* will also be used to refer to the set of crossing edges defined by the partition of the vertices.

Proposition 1 (optimality conditions). *Let G be a connected graph with coloring c of the edges. The following properties hold:*

- (i) *Cut optimality condition. Let us consider a cut C in G with no blue edge. If there is some uncolored edge $e \in C$ such that $\text{OWA}(v^e - v^{e'}) \leq 0$ for all uncolored edges $e' \in C$, then e belongs to an OWA-optimal tree in $\mathcal{T}(c)$.*
- (ii) *Cycle optimality condition. Let us consider a cycle C in G containing no red edge. If there is some uncolored edge $e \in C$ such that $\text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e) \leq 0$ for all uncolored edges $e' \in C$, then e can be colored red without changing value $\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(c)} \text{OWA}(f(T))$.*

Proof. The proof relies on the following property of function OWA with non-increasing weights: $\text{OWA}(y - y') \geq \text{OWA}(y) - \text{OWA}(y')$. To prove this property, one uses the convexity of function OWA, which follows from the fact that $\text{OWA}(y) = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_i w_i y_{\pi(i)}$ where Π is the set of all possible permutations of $(1, \dots, p)$. Combining convexity of OWA and equality $\text{OWA}(\lambda y) = \lambda \text{OWA}(y)$, one deduces thus the required inequality: $\text{OWA}(y - y') + \text{OWA}(y') = 2(\frac{1}{2}\text{OWA}(y - y') + \frac{1}{2}\text{OWA}(y')) \geq 2\text{OWA}(\frac{1}{2}(y - y') + \frac{1}{2}y') = \text{OWA}(y)$.

Proof of (i). Suppose there exists a cut C and an uncolored crossing edge e that satisfies the cut optimality condition. Let T be an OWA-optimal spanning tree of $\mathcal{T}(c)$ that does not contain e . Now consider the graph formed by adding e to T . This graph has a cycle that contains e , and this cycle must contain at least one other uncolored crossing edge — say e' — such that $e' \in C$, and therefore we have $\text{OWA}(v^e - v^{e'}) \leq 0$. We can get a new spanning tree $T' \in \mathcal{T}(c)$ by deleting e' from T and adding e . We claim that $\text{OWA}(f(T')) \leq \text{OWA}(f(T))$. Cost $f(T')$ is indeed equal to $f(T) - v^{e'} + v^e$. By the property indicated above, we have $\text{OWA}(f(T) - v^{e'} + v^e) - \text{OWA}(f(T)) \leq \text{OWA}(f(T) - v^{e'} + v^e - f(T)) = \text{OWA}(v^e - v^{e'})$. Consequently, since $\text{OWA}(v^e - v^{e'}) \leq 0$, we deduce $\text{OWA}(f(T')) = \text{OWA}(f(T) - v^{e'} + v^e) \leq \text{OWA}(f(T))$, and T' is therefore an OWA-optimal spanning tree in $\mathcal{T}(c)$ (that does contain e).

Proof of (ii). Suppose there exists a cycle C containing no red edge with an uncolored edge $e \in C$ such that $\text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e) \leq 0$ for all uncolored edges $e' \in C$. Let T be an OWA-optimal spanning tree of $\mathcal{T}(c)$ that contains e . Now consider the graph formed by removing e from T . This graph is compounded of two connected components. The induced cut contains at least one other uncolored crossing edge — say e' — such that $e' \in C$, and therefore $\text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e) \leq 0$. We can get a new spanning tree $T' \in \mathcal{T}(c)$ by deleting e from T and adding e' . We claim that $\text{OWA}(f(T')) \leq \text{OWA}(f(T))$. Cost $f(T')$ is indeed equal to $f(T) - v^e + v^{e'}$. By the property indicated above, we have $\text{OWA}(f(T) - v^e + v^{e'}) - \text{OWA}(f(T)) \leq \text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e)$. Consequently, since $\text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e) \leq 0$, we deduce $\text{OWA}(f(T')) \leq \text{OWA}(f(T))$, and T' is therefore an OWA-optimal spanning tree in $\mathcal{T}(c)$ (that does not contain e). $\square$

Let us come back to the instance of Example 1 to illustrate how to color edges according to these conditions.

Example 2. *In the clique of Example 1, by considering cut $\{[1, 4], [2, 4], [3, 4]\}$, edge $[1, 4]$ can be colored blue since $\text{OWA}(v^{[1,4]} - v^{[2,4]}) = \text{OWA}(-1, -4, 1) = -0.6$ (with $w_1 = 0.5$, $w_2 = 0.3$ and $w_3 = 0.2$) and $\text{OWA}(v^{[1,4]} - v^{[3,4]}) = \text{OWA}(0, -3, 1) = -0.1$. Furthermore, by considering cycle $\{[2, 4], [2, 3], [3, 4]\}$, edge $[2, 4]$ can be colored red since $\text{OWA}(v^{[2,3]} - v^{[2,4]}) = \text{OWA}(0, -2, 0) = -0.4$ and $\text{OWA}(v^{[3,4]} - v^{[2,4]}) = \text{OWA}(-1, -1, 0) = -0.5$.*

```

Algorithm PREPROCESSING( $G, c$ )
Input : A graph  $G$  with coloring  $c$  of edges
Output : A maximal coloring  $c$ 
for each edge  $e$  of  $E$  do
  if the cut optimality condition holds for  $e$  then
    set  $c(e) = \text{blue}$ 
  else if the cycle optimality condition holds for  $e$  then
    set  $c(e) = \text{red}$ 
return  $c$ 

```

Figure 1: Preprocessing algorithm in the case of strictly decreasing weights.

Note that Pareto-dominance of edge e' over edge e implies $\text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e) \leq 0$ since all components of $v^{e'} - v^e$ are negative in such a case (see edge $[2, 4]$ in the previous example). Our optimality conditions are thus an enrichment of the multiobjective optimality conditions of Sourd and Spanjaard [35], which are sufficient conditions for an edge to be mandatory or forbidden when generating the whole Pareto set. These conditions are indeed exclusively based on Pareto dominance between edges. We take here advantage of the knowledge of the OWA operator to optimize so as to be able to color a higher number of edges.

The single objective versions of these conditions make it possible to design a generic greedy method [e.g. 37], from which Kruskal's and Prim's algorithms can be derived. For problem OWA-ST, this method can be adapted so as to preprocess the graph prior to the resolution of the MIP formulation by a solver. The corresponding algorithm is indicated in Figure 1. Obviously, and contrarily to the single objective case, this preprocessing method does not yield a spanning tree since binary relation $\text{OWA}(v^e - v^{e'}) \leq 0$ does not induce a complete ordering of the edges in E . It enables however an important reduction of the number of variables (see numerical experiments), and therefore of the resolution time.

The complexity of the preprocessing method strongly depends on the complexity of detecting uncolored edges satisfying an optimality condition. In practice, to determine whether an uncolored edge $e = [i, j]$ satisfies the cut optimality condition, one performs a depth first search from i in the partial graph $G_e^{\text{cut}} = (V, E_e^{\text{cut}})$ where $E_e^{\text{cut}} = \{e' \in E \mid \text{OWA}(v^e - v^{e'}) > 0\} \cup \{e' \in E \mid c(e') = \text{blue}\}$. If j does not belong to the set of visited vertices, then the partition between visited and non-visited vertices constitutes a cut for which e satisfies the cut optimality condition. Similarly, to determine whether an uncolored edge $e = [i, j]$ satisfies the cycle optimality condition, one performs a depth first search from i in the partial graph $G_e^{\text{cyc}} = (V, E_e^{\text{cyc}})$ where $E_e^{\text{cyc}} = \{e' \in E \mid \text{OWA}(v^{e'} - v^e) \leq 0\} \setminus \{e\} \cup \{e' \in E \mid c(e') = \text{blue}\}$. If j is visited, then the chain from i to j in the search tree, completed with $[i, j]$, constitutes a cycle for which e satisfies the cycle optimality condition. Since the number of edges in the graph is m and the complexity of a depth first search is within $O(m)$ in a connected graph, the complexity of the overall preprocessing is $O(m^2)$.

4. Resolution methods for arbitrary weights

The linearization of the objective function is not valid anymore when the weights are not strictly decreasing. Facing the difficulty induced by the non-linearity of the objective function, we propose to resort to a branch and bound procedure when the weights are not necessarily strictly decreasing. For such procedures, the efficient computation of bounds on the optimal value of problem OWA-ST is therefore worth investigating. Besides, even when the weights are strictly decreasing, such bounds can be used in a shaving procedure (see Subsection 4.4 for a description) performed before the resolution phase in order to reduce the size of the instance. Thus, to obtain lower bounds, we present here two alternative relaxation methods for a multiobjective compromise search problem P : $\min \varphi(y)$ s.t. $y = f(x)$, $x \in X$, as defined in Subsection 2.1.

- *Relaxation of the image set*: it consists in defining a subspace $Y' \supseteq Y$ of the objective space (we recall that $Y = f(X)$) and solving problem $P_{Y'}$ defined by:

$$(P_{Y'}) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \varphi(y) \\ \text{s.t.} & y \in Y' \end{cases}$$

- *Relaxation of the objective function:* it consists in defining a function $\varphi' : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for all images y in Y , $\varphi'(y) \leq \varphi(y)$ and solving problem $P_{\varphi'}$ defined by:

$$(P_{\varphi'}) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \varphi'(y) \\ \text{s.t.} & y = f(x) \\ & x \in X \end{cases}$$

The main point is then to define Y' (resp. φ') such that the optimal value of problem $P_{Y'}$ (resp. $P_{\varphi'}$) can be efficiently computed and provide the tightest bound as possible. In this concern, it seems opportune to consider some continuous relaxations of Y (resp. linear aggregation function φ'). In the following, we show more precisely how these relaxations can be performed when the aggregation function is an ordered weighted average. Note that, in both relaxations presented in the following, the computational efficiency of the procedure (to solve $P_{Y'}$ or $P_{\varphi'}$) only depends on the ability to quickly solve the single objective version of the problem. Consequently, these procedures can be applied to a broad spectrum of problems for which the single objective version can be solved efficiently.

4.1. Defining Y' and solving problem $P_{Y'}$

We now present a first bound on the value of an optimal solution to P , obtained by relaxation of the image set. For this purpose, let us define relaxed space Y' in program $P_{Y'}$ as follows:

$$Y' = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^p : y_i \geq b_i \quad \forall i = 0, \dots, p\}$$

where $b_i = \min\{f_i(x) : x \in X\}$ denotes the value of an optimal solution according to f_i , and $f_0 = \sum_{i=1}^p f_i$. The values b_i 's ($i = 1, \dots, p$) are obtained by n runs of a standard algorithm for the single objective version of the problem (provided it can be efficiently solved) for valuations f_i 's successively ($i = 1, \dots, p$). Concerning the computation of b_0 , for simplicity purpose, we only detail the case of multiobjective spanning tree problems. The value b_0 is obtained by applying a standard minimal spanning tree algorithm on the graph where each edge e is valued by $v_0^e = \sum_{i=1}^p v_i^e$: for any spanning tree characterized by x , we have indeed $f_0(x) = \sum_{i=1}^p f_i(x) = \sum_{i=1}^p (\sum_{e \in E} v_i^e x^e) = \sum_{e \in E} (\sum_{i=1}^p v_i^e) x^e = \sum_{e \in E} v_0^e x^e$. Note that this technique to compute b_0 extends to many multiobjective versions of classical combinatorial optimization problems (actually, as soon as the value of a feasible solution is additively decomposable over its elements).

As indicated above, in order for the relaxation to be interesting in practice, one needs to provide an efficient procedure to compute the optimal value of program $P_{Y'}$. When the objective function is OWA, one clearly needs to take into account the way the components of solution y are ordered for solving $P_{Y'}$. The OWA function is actually piecewise linear. More precisely, it is linear within each subspace of $\mathbb{R}^p$ where all vectors are comonotonic, i.e. for any pair y, y' of vectors, there exists a permutation π of $(1, \dots, p)$ such that $y_{\pi(1)} \geq \dots \geq y_{\pi(p)}$ and $y'_{\pi(1)} \geq \dots \geq y'_{\pi(p)}$. Problem $P_{Y'}$ can thus be divided into several subproblems, each one focusing on a particular comonotonic subspace of $\mathbb{R}^p$. The solution of $P_{Y'}$ reduces to solving each linear program $P_{Y', \pi}$ defined by a particular permutation π of $(1, \dots, p)$:

$$(P_{Y', \pi}) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \sum_{i=1}^p w_i y_{\pi(i)} \\ \text{s.t.} & y_{\pi(i)} \geq y_{\pi(i+1)} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}, & (1.1) \\ & y_i \geq b_i \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, & (1.2) \\ & \sum_{i=1}^p y_i \geq b_0, & (1.3) \\ & y \in \mathbb{R}^p. \end{cases}$$

The value of the optimal solution $y_{Y'}^*$ to $P_{Y'}$ is then $\min_{\pi \in \Pi} \text{OWA}(y_{Y', \pi}^*)$ where $y_{Y', \pi}^*$ denotes the optimal solution to linear program $P_{Y', \pi}$ and Π the set of all possible permutations. Note that for p components, there are $|\Pi|=p!$ linear programs to solve. However, in practice, it is not necessary to solve the $p!$ linear programs. There exists indeed an easily computable permutation π^* for which $\text{OWA}(y_{Y'}^*) = \text{OWA}(y_{Y', \pi^*}^*)$:

Proposition 2 (Galand and Spanjaard, 2007 [10]). *Let π^* denote the permutation such that $b_{\pi^*(1)} \geq b_{\pi^*(2)} \geq \dots \geq b_{\pi^*(p)}$. For any feasible solution y to P_{Y', π^*} , there exists a feasible solution y' to P_{Y', π^*} such that $\text{OWA}(y') = \text{OWA}(y)$.*

Proof. The idea is to determine a feasible solution y' to P_{Y', π^*} such that $y'_{(i)} = y_{(i)} \quad \forall i$ (where $y_{(1)} \geq \dots \geq y_{(p)}$). It implies indeed $\text{OWA}(y) = \text{OWA}(y')$ and the conclusion is then straightforward. In this respect, we construct a sequence

$(y^j)_{j=1,\dots,k}$ of solutions and a sequence $(\pi^j)_{j=1,\dots,k}$ of permutations such that y^j is feasible for P_{Y',π^j} (for $j=1, \dots, k$), with $y^1=y, \pi^1=\pi, \pi^k=\pi^*$ and $y^1_{(i)}=y^2_{(i)}=\dots=y^k_{(i)} \forall i$. Assume there exist $i_0, i_1 \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $i_0 < i_1$ and $b_{\pi^1(i_0)} < b_{\pi^1(i_1)}$. Let permutation π^2 be defined by $\pi^2(i_0)=\pi^1(i_1), \pi^2(i_1)=\pi^1(i_0)$, and $\pi^2(i)=\pi^1(i) \forall i \neq i_0, i_1$. Let solution y^2 be defined by $y^2_{\pi^2(i)}=y^1_{\pi^1(i)}$ for $i=1, \dots, p$. We now show that y^2 is a feasible solution to P_{Y',π^2} . Note first that $y^1_{\pi^1(i_0)} \geq b_{\pi^1(i_0)}, y^1_{\pi^1(i_1)} \geq b_{\pi^1(i_1)}, y^1_{\pi^1(i_0)} \geq y^1_{\pi^1(i_1)}$ and $b_{\pi^1(i_1)} > b_{\pi^1(i_0)}$. Hence, constraints 1.2 are satisfied since:

- $y^2_{\pi^2(i_0)}=y^1_{\pi^1(i_0)} \geq y^1_{\pi^1(i_1)} \geq b_{\pi^1(i_1)}=b_{\pi^2(i_0)},$
- $y^2_{\pi^2(i_1)}=y^1_{\pi^1(i_1)} \geq b_{\pi^1(i_1)} > b_{\pi^1(i_0)}=b_{\pi^2(i_1)},$
- $y^2_{\pi^2(i)}=y^1_{\pi^1(i)} \geq b_{\pi^1(i)}=b_{\pi^2(i)}$ for $i \neq i_0, i_1$.

Constraints 1.1 are also satisfied since $[y^1_{\pi^1(i)} \geq y^1_{\pi^1(i+1)} \forall i] \Rightarrow [y^2_{\pi^2(i)} \geq y^2_{\pi^2(i+1)} \forall i]$. Indeed, we have $y^1_{\pi^1(i)}=y^2_{\pi^2(i)} \forall i$. These equalities imply also that constraint 1.3 is satisfied and that $y^2_{(i)}=y_{(i)} \forall i$. Solution y^2 is therefore feasible for P_{Y',π^2} with $y^2_{(i)}=y_{(i)} \forall i$. Since any permutation is the product of elementary permutations, one always can construct in this way a sequence of permutations that leads to π^* (and the corresponding feasible solutions). By setting $y'=y^k$, one obtains the desired feasible solution to P_{Y',π^*} . $\square$

An immediate consequence of this result is that $\text{OWA}(y_{Y'}^*) = \text{OWA}(y_{Y',\pi^*}^*)$. Thus, the computation of $\text{OWA}(y_{Y'}^*)$ reduces to solving linear program P_{Y',π^*} . For the sake of illustration, we present below an example.

Example 3. Let us come back to Example 1 where bounds b_i 's are defined from spanning trees T_1, T_2 and T_3 by $b_1 = 4, b_2 = 7, b_3 = 3$. The optimal spanning tree with respect to f_0 is spanning tree $T = \{[1, 4], [2, 3], [3, 4]\}$ with $f_0(T) = 19$. The value of b_0 is then 19. It yields the following program $P_{Y'}$ (the values of w_1, w_2 and w_3 do not matter):

$$\begin{cases} \min & \text{OWA}(y) = w_1 y_{(1)} + w_2 y_{(2)} + w_3 y_{(3)} \\ \text{s.t.} & y_1 \geq 4 \quad y_2 \geq 7 \quad y_3 \geq 3, \\ & y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \geq 19, \\ & y_1 \in \mathbb{R}, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, y_3 \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

As a consequence of Proposition 2, solving $P_{Y'}$ amounts to solving linear program P_{Y',π^*} defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \min & w_1 y_2 + w_2 y_1 + w_3 y_3 \\ \text{s.t.} & y_2 \geq y_1 \geq y_3, \\ & y_1 \geq 4 \quad y_2 \geq 7 \quad y_3 \geq 3, \\ & y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \geq 19, \\ & y_1 \in \mathbb{R}, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, y_3 \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

We have indeed $\pi^*(1) = 2, \pi^*(2) = 1$ and $\pi^*(3) = 3$ since $b_2 \geq b_1 \geq b_3$. When $w_1 = 0.5, w_2 = 0.3$ and $w_3 = 0.2$, the value of the bound provided by program P_{Y',π^*} is therefore 6.5 (we recall that the value of the OWA-optimal spanning tree is 7).

4.2. Defining φ' and solving problem $P_{\varphi'}$

The second bound for P is obtained by relaxation of the objective function. The idea is to use a linear function φ' defined by $\varphi'(y) = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i y_i$ where the vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$ of coefficients satisfy the following constraints:

$$\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{|I|} w_i \quad \text{for all subset } I \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \text{ of objectives} \quad (1)$$

When using such weight vectors, we have indeed $\varphi'(y) \leq \varphi(y)$ for all y in Y , as established by the following:

Proposition 3. Let Λ denote the set of all vectors $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying Constraint 1. If $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i y_i \leq \text{OWA}(y)$.

Proof. Let π denote a permutation such that $y_{\pi(1)} \geq \dots \geq y_{\pi(p)}$. Note first that $\text{OWA}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^p w_i y_{\pi(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^p (\sum_{j=1}^i w_j)(y_{\pi(i)} - y_{\pi(i+1)})$ where $y_{\pi(p+1)} = 0$. By Constraint 1 with subset of objectives $I = \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$, we have

$\sum_{j=1}^i w_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_{\pi(j)} \forall i$. Thus $\sum_{i=1}^p (\sum_{j=1}^i w_j)(y_{\pi(i)} - y_{\pi(i+1)}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^p (\sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_{\pi(j)})(y_{\pi(i)} - y_{\pi(i+1)})$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^p (\sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_{\pi(j)})(y_{\pi(i)} - y_{\pi(i+1)}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_{\pi(i)} y_{\pi(i)}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_{\pi(i)} y_{\pi(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i y_i$, we have $\text{OWA}(y) \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i y_i$. $\square$

This result can be seen as a specific instantiation of a more general result of Schmeidler [32, 33] on Choquet integrals in decision under uncertainty (OWA being a particular subclass of Choquet integrals). Schmeidler's result has been used to provide bounds in Choquet-based optimization under uncertainty [8], as well as under multiple objectives [9]. Note that, in the case of decreasing weights in OWA, a useful by-product of Schmeidler's result is the existence of a normalized set of weights (i.e., summing up to 1) such that Proposition 3 holds: for instance, when setting $\lambda_i = 1/p$, we have $\sum_i (1/p) y_i \leq \text{OWA}(y)$ by Chebyshev's sum inequality. Nevertheless, when the weights are not decreasing, the existence of normalized weights satisfying Constraint 1 is not guaranteed.

Solving problem $P_{\varphi'}$ can be efficiently done by valuing every edge e by $\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i v_i^e$ and then performing a standard minimum spanning tree algorithm. Besides, in order to obtain the best lower bound as possible, the optimal set of weights $\lambda \in \Lambda$ (i.e., providing the best lower bound according to Proposition 3) can be obtained by solving the following program:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^p} \quad & z(\lambda) = \min_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i y_i, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{|I|} w_i \quad \forall I \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}, \\ & \lambda_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, p. \end{aligned}$$

Given that z is a concave piecewise linear function of λ for a fixed y (since it is the lower envelope of a set of linear functions $\{\sum_{i=1}^p y_i \lambda_i : y \in Y\}$), we solve this program by using the SolvOpt library [17], which is an implementation of Shor's r -algorithm [34]. This algorithm is indeed especially convenient for non-differentiable optimization, and the implemented SolvOpt library enables to perform constrained optimization. This approach is closed to the lower bounding procedure proposed by Punnen and Aneja [29] for min-max combinatorial optimization. In broad outline, it can be viewed as a sequence of minimum spanning tree computations according to a varying weight vector λ , until convergence towards a weight vector maximizing $\min_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i y_i$.

Example 4. Let us come back to the instance of Example 1. Running Shor's r -algorithm yields $\lambda = (0.28, 0.5, 0.22)$ and $y = (6, 8, 6)$ (the image of spanning tree $\{[1, 2], [1, 4], [2, 3]\}$, which is actually OWA-optimal). The bound is therefore $0.28 \times 6 + 0.5 \times 8 + 0.22 \times 6 = 7$ (which is the value of an OWA-optimal tree). This is better than the bound obtained by the previous relaxation (value 6.5). The computational burden is however more important, since it requires to solve much more single objective problems.

4.3. Branch and bound procedure

The two bounds presented above can of course be inserted into a branch and bound procedure in order to determine an OWA-optimal spanning tree for arbitrary weights. We summarize below the main features of the branch and bound procedure we propose.

Branching scheme. The branching scheme is very simple: at each node, an edge e of G is selected and two subproblems are created. In the first one, edge e is mandatory while in the second one, edge e is forbidden. The heuristic to select the next edge consists in searching for an edge e such that $\sum_{i=1}^p v_i^e$ is minimal among the remaining ones.

Computing the lower bound. The lower bound at each node of the branching tree is computed by relaxation of the image set (by generating and solving problem $P_{Y'}$) or by relaxation of the objective function (by solving a sequence of problems $P_{\varphi'}$).

Updating the incumbent. When defining and solving problem $P_{Y'}$ or $P_{\varphi'}$, the algorithm checks whether a newly computed spanning tree is better than the current best known spanning tree according to OWA. We take indeed advantage of the property that feasible spanning trees are generated when computing the lower bound: either $p + 1$ spanning trees are generated to obtain the values of b_i ($i = 0, \dots, p$) in $P_{Y'}$ or a sequence of spanning trees is generated during the running of Shor's r -algorithm to find the best possible bound according to $P_{\varphi'}$.

Initialization. A branch and bound algorithm is notoriously more efficient when a good solution is known even before starting the search. The initial solution in our method is the best known solution (according to OWA) after the run of the shaving procedure described below.

4.4. Shaving procedure

The definition of lower bounds makes it possible to resort to a *shaving* procedure in order to reduce the size of the instance before running the main algorithm. The term “shaving” was introduced by Martin and Shmoys [21] for the job-shop scheduling problem. Assuming at least a feasible solution is known, this procedure works as follows: for each edge e , we build a subproblem in which e is made mandatory. If the computation of the lower bound proves that the subproblem cannot improve the current best known solution, then it means that e can be made definitively forbidden (colored red). Conversely when e has not been colored red by the previous procedure, we test similarly whether e can be made definitively mandatory (colored blue). Note that, here again, when computing the lower bounds, one checks whether a newly detected spanning tree improves the current best known solution (according to OWA). Of course, the shaving procedure is all the more efficient as a good feasible solution is initially known. For this purpose, we generate k feasible solutions by running a k -best ranking algorithm (i.e., returning the k best solutions) for the minimum spanning tree problem on the instance valued by the arithmetic mean of the vectors. The choice of k depends on the size of the instance.

Example 5. *Let us come back again to the clique of Example 1. Assuming that the k -best ranking algorithm is run for $k = 2$, the current best known solution is then spanning tree $T_4 = \{[1, 2], [1, 4], [2, 3]\}$. Let us now simulate the progress of the shaving procedure. Making edge $[1, 2]$ forbidden, the minimum spanning tree for weight vector $\lambda = (0.3, 0.5, 0.2)$ is $\{[1, 3], [1, 4], [2, 3]\}$ with image $y = (7, 9, 4)$. The induced lower bound is 7.4, which is strictly greater than the OWA-value of T_4 ($\text{OWA}(f(T_4)) = 7$). Therefore edge $[1, 2]$ is colored blue. Then making edge $[1, 3]$ mandatory, the minimum spanning tree for weight vector $\lambda = (0.5, 0.3, 0.2)$ is $\{[1, 2], [1, 3], [1, 4]\}$ with image $y = (8, 7, 6)$. The induced lower bound is 7.3, which is strictly greater than the OWA-value of T_4 . Therefore edge $[1, 3]$ is colored red. Next, making edge $[1, 4]$ forbidden, the minimum spanning tree for weight vector $\lambda = (0.3, 0.5, 0.2)$ is $\{[1, 2], [2, 3], [3, 4]\}$ with image $y = (6, 11, 5)$. The induced lower bound is 8.3, and edge $[1, 4]$ is therefore colored blue. Finally, making edge $[2, 3]$ forbidden, the minimum spanning tree for weight vector $\lambda = (0.2, 0.5, 0.3)$ is $\{[1, 2], [1, 4], [3, 4]\}$ with image $y = (5, 9, 6)$. The induced lower bound is 7.3, and consequently edge $[2, 3]$ is colored blue. All edges of T_4 are colored blue: one concludes that T_4 is an OWA-optimal spanning tree without even starting the main algorithm.*

5. Experimental results

Before we study more carefully the behavior of our algorithms, we give some insights into previous results on related topics. The most widely studied related topic is the generation of the Pareto set in the bi-objective spanning tree problem [3, 14, 30, 35, 36]. To our knowledge, the most efficient algorithm for this problem enables to solve randomly drawn clique instances containing up to 400 vertices [35] (note that these results significantly improved the size of the instances that could be handled, since it grew from 40 to 400 vertices). However these results do not extend to more than two objectives. More generally, even when looking for a single compromise solution within the Pareto set, it seems that there is very few available numerical experiments in the literature for more than two objectives. Although several works deal with the min-max spanning tree problem (i.e. determining a spanning tree minimizing the max criterion) [1, 2, 14, 39, 44], the content of these works is indeed mainly theoretical. Actually, the only numerical results we know for more than two objectives are devoted to the determination of a Choquet-optimal spanning tree [9]. The size of the tackled instances goes from 30 to 70 vertices according to the number of objectives and the parameterization of the Choquet integral.

5.1. Experimental details

All the algorithms have been implemented in C++ and were run on a 2.6 GHz personal computer with a memory of 3.4GB. The test instances are defined as follows. All considered graphs are cliques. The components of cost vectors are randomly drawn between 1 and 100 on each edge. The number of objectives varies from 3 to 10, and the number

of vertices from 10 to 100 for strictly decreasing weights, and from 10 to 25 for non-monotonic weights. For each kind of instances (depending on the number of nodes and on the number of objectives), 30 instances were randomly drawn to obtain average results.

5.2. Tests with strictly decreasing weights

The global procedure to solve problem P_{OWA} when the weights are strictly decreasing consists of two phases:

1. *Coloration phase*: making the most possible edges blue (mandatory) or red (forbidden) by running first the preprocessing procedure, and then a shaving procedure taking into account the coloration obtained by preprocessing.
2. *Resolution phase*: determining the OWA-optimal spanning tree by running the main resolution algorithm (solution by MIP or branch and bound) on the reduced instance.

In this section, one summarizes the results one has obtained by running this global procedure. For initializing the shaving procedure in the coloration phase, the k -best ranking algorithm proposed by Katoh et al. [18] is launched for k varying from 500 to 5000 depending on the size of the instance. In all cases, the order of magnitude of its running time is about a few milliseconds. Concerning the shaving itself, preliminary results have shown that it is much more efficient when the bound is defined by relaxation of the objective function than by the relaxation of the image set, especially when the size of the instances grows. For this reason, one only summarizes here the execution times obtained when the shaving procedure is performed by relaxation of the objective function. This shaving procedure is denoted by $sh_{\varphi'}$ in the sequel. Finally, one compares the various resolution algorithms proposed in this paper: the solution by MIP and the one by branch and bound (two versions according to the bound adopted). The mixed integer program is solved by using solver ILOG CPLEX 11. Regarding the branch and bound procedure, the bounds proposed in Section 4 are compared: the one obtained by relaxation of the objective function, and the one obtained by relaxation of the image set.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 summarize the results obtained by running the algorithms on cliques with respectively 3, 5 or 10 objectives (the weights of the OWA operator are indicated in the caption of the tables), for various numbers of vertices for which the average resolution time is lower than 30 minutes. The upper part of the tables summarizes the informations about the coloration phase (line pp for the preprocessing procedure and line $sh_{\varphi'}$ for the shaving procedure). For each procedure and each size of instance, the average execution time is indicated. Furthermore, below line pp (resp. $sh_{\varphi'}$), the average number of edges made blue ($\#b$) or red ($\#r$) after preprocessing (resp. after preprocessing *and* shaving) is indicated (couple $(\#b - \#r)$). In the lower part of the tables are indicated the average total resolution times for various combinations of procedures for the coloration phase and the resolution phase. To evaluate the variability of the resolution time, the minimal running time (min) as well as the maximal one (max) are also indicated (couple min – max under the average execution time). To encode the combinations, the following abbreviations are used: MIP stands of course for Mixed Integer Programming, $BB_{\varphi'}$ for the branch and bound obtained by relaxation of the image set, and BB_{φ} for the branch and bound obtained by relaxation of the objective function. Note that, in order to show the impact of the coloration phase, the first line of the lower part indicates the resolution times when solving the MIP formulation without resorting to any preprocessing or shaving.

Table 1 shows that the best results are obtained by using the MIP formulation with a coloration phase. This is the only algorithm able to handle instances with more than 60 vertices with an average computation time below 30 minutes. It is essential to note that the coloration phase has a very significative impact on the computation time. For $n = 60$, one sees indeed that the resolution time for MIP is above 1000 seconds, while it is below 100 seconds when the coloration phase is used. This can be easily understood by observing that the number of colored edges at the end of the coloration phase is a low fraction of the initial number of edges. For instance, in average, it remains only 67 uncolored edges over 4950 for $n = 100$. The main interest of preprocessing is that it enables to color a lot of edges in a very low computation time. Hence, the number of edges that are tested during the shaving procedure is reduced, which is computationally interesting since the shaving is more powerful but takes also much more time. Performing shaving after preprocessing makes it possible to color blue a large part of the optimal spanning tree in a reasonable computation time. For illustration, in average, preprocessing colors red 4520.8 edges for $n = 100$, and shaving colors blue 71.6 edges (including those colored blue by preprocessing) over a maximum number of 99. A large amount of the total resolution time is spent in the coloration phase: for $n = 100$, 988.84 seconds are spent in average in the coloration phase ($pp+sh_{\varphi'}$) over a total resolution time of 1167.83 seconds. Finally, note that there is an important

n	20	30	40	50	60
pp	0 (2.8 - 128.3)	0.02 (4.4 - 332)	0.05 (5.8 - 628.3)	0.11 (6.3 - 1025.4)	0.21 (7.1 - 1524.9)
sh $_{\varphi'}$	0.51 (12 - 160.7)	2.89 (20.1 - 390)	10.76 (26.1 - 720.5)	31.43 (33.5 - 1154.7)	79.19 (37.9 - 1680.4)
MIP	0.51 0.02 - 4.65	2.8 0.2 - 20.3	8.11 0.45 - 49.7	56.11 0.88 - 639.9	1018.5 1.58 - 16842
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +MIP	0.55 0.31 - 0.99	3.04 2.26 - 4.93	11.73 7.88 - 32.55	32.26 25.7 - 43.4	89.38 68.8 - 177.3
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{Y'}$	0.58 0.31 - 1.49	3.11 2.26 - 5.79	25.89 7.87 - 345.4	34.51 25.7 - 67.7	241.52 68.8 - 1945.5
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{\varphi'}$	1.35 0.32 - 3.79	10.27 2.71 - 37.2	72.1 8 - 571.2	206 28.5 - 1183.3	1049.7 75.8 - 4457.9

n	70	80	90	100
pp	0.34 (8.5 - 2125.2)	0.54 (9.3 - 2827.8)	0.79 (12 - 3624.1)	1.14 (13.2 - 4520.8)
sh $_{\varphi'}$	165.6 (50.1 - 2318)	314.7 (52.8 - 3044.7)	563.7 (63.1 - 3879.1)	987.7 (71.6 - 4811.4)
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +MIP	266.94 138.3 - 3206.5	342.79 267.1 - 720.6	590.98 475.2 - 1025.3	1167.83 810.6 - 4453

Table 1: Synthesis of the numerical results for 3 objectives ($w_1 = 0.6$, $w_2 = 0.3$ and $w_3 = 0.1$). Execution times are indicated in seconds.

variability in the resolution time according to the instance (for $n = 60$, the MIP algorithm takes between 1.58 seconds and more than 4 hours and half). The coloration phase tends however to reduce this variability.

n	10	20	30	40	50	60
pp	0 (0.16 - 8.36)	0.01 (0.18 - 63.42)	0.02 (0.27 - 187.2)	0.065 (0.16 - 384.9)	0.14 (0.27 - 668)	0.27 (0.3 - 1034.9)
sh $_{\varphi'}$	0.13 (3.54 - 26.84)	1.71 (5.42 - 142.5)	10.5 (8.13 - 359.3)	43.57 (9.92 - 667.1)	132.21 (12.77 - 1079.7)	337.13 (15.52 - 1596.3)
MIP	0.07 0.03 - 0.14	1.74 0.12 - 12.06	52.39 0.59 - 1166.2	133.8 0.94 - 3591	1426.7 12.26 - 16610	- -
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +MIP	0.16 0.09 - 0.24	2.63 1.47 - 12.83	27.27 8.66 - 284.2	87.66 38.88 - 693	433.8 110.5 - 2589.6	1202.7 301.8 - 10153.4
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{Y'}$	0.17 0.09 - 0.62	14.23 1.5 - 218.8	764 8.75 - 13767.5	- -	- -	- -
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{\varphi'}$	0.37 0.09 - 2.02	19.63 2.58 - 91.58	541.3 13.52 - 5018.5	- -	- -	- -

Table 2: Synthesis of the numerical results for 5 objectives ($w_1 = 0.5$, $w_2 = 0.3$, $w_3 = 0.1$, $w_4 = 0.06$ and $w_5 = 0.04$). Execution times are indicated in seconds. Symbol “-” means that the average execution time exceeds 30 minutes.

Tables 2 and 3 show that the number of objectives has a great impact on the performances of the algorithms. For instance, for $n = 60$, the resolution time of algorithm pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +MIP is 1202.7 seconds in average for 5 objectives, compared to 89.38 seconds for 3 objectives. Besides, for 10 objectives, one can only handle instances with up to 35 vertices within the time limit of 30 minutes. The resolution time is also sensitive to the weights of the OWA operator. In order to evaluate this sensitivity, we also performed a test with weights inducing an OWA operator closer to the arithmetic mean. Namely, we set $w_1 = 0.4$, $w_2 = 0.35$ and $w_3 = 0.25$.

For this set of weights, all the tested algorithms perform better, as it can be seen in Table 4. In particular, the preprocessing procedure makes it possible to color blue more edges than for the previous set of weights. For example,

n	10	15	20	30	35
pp	0 (0 - 2.22)	0 (0 - 8.73)	0.01 (0.03 - 20.2)	0.03 (0.03 - 69.5)	0.05 (0.03 - 108.5)
sh $_{\varphi'}$	2.69 (3.78 - 25.58)	5.21 (2.43 - 58.33)	11.41 (1.83 - 107.07)	44 (1.1 - 256.7)	86.57 (1.3 - 365.27)
MIP	0.15 0.05 - 0.55	1.87 0.13 - 7.65	11.47 0.6 - 33.65	519.2 4.76 - 6623	- -
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +MIP	2.77 2.32 - 3.58	6.54 4.42 - 12.52	19.29 10.2 - 40.6	311 41.26 - 2937.3	1284.8 188.1 - 8504.6
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{Y'}$	3.15 2.32 - 8.47	91.74 4.41 - 532.71	- -	- -	- -
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{\varphi'}$	7.93 2.32 - 25.75	58.27 5.21 - 317	477.4 13.32 - 2109.5	- -	- -

Table 3: Synthesis of the numerical results for 10 objectives ($w_1 = 0.25$, $w_2 = 0.2$, $w_3 = 0.15$, $w_4 = 0.1$, $w_5 = 0.09$, $w_6 = 0.08$, $w_7 = 0.06$, $w_8 = 0.04$, $w_9 = 0.02$ and $w_{10} = 0.01$). Execution times are indicated in seconds. Symbol “-” means that the average execution time exceeds 30 minutes.

n	40	50	60	70	80
pp	0.06 (23.57 - 717.6)	0.12 (30.47 - 1148.5)	0.22 (35.9 - 1675.2)	0.38 (41.85 - 2305.7)	0.59 (48 - 3033.6)
sh $_{\varphi'}$	2.75 (32.5 - 733.9)	7.22 (41.9 - 1167.3)	18.65 (49.3 - 1700.2)	37.51 (57.1 - 2334.9)	74.3 (64.85 - 3064.8)
MIP	7 0.25 - 94.75	65.24 0.57 - 830.3	243.8 7.12 - 3227	- -	- -
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +MIP	2.81 2.04 - 3.96	7.35 4.22 - 11.37	18.9 14.23 - 22.75	37.96 26.26 - 48.95	75.21 55 - 95.15
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{Y'}$	2.82 2.04 - 4.01	7.38 4.22 - 11.86	18.97 14.23 - 23.04	38.376 26.26 - 55.59	77.85 54.99 - 104.1
pp+sh $_{\varphi'}$ +BB $_{\varphi'}$	5.37 2.1 - 17.03	13.28 4.33 - 48.46	51.5 15.57 - 184.5	114.9 26.57 - 484.1	391.1 64.08 - 1853.1

Table 4: Synthesis of the numerical results for 3 objectives ($w_1 = 0.4$, $w_2 = 0.35$ and $w_3 = 0.25$). Execution times are indicated in seconds.

for $n = 60$, 49.3 edges are colored blue in average (over a maximal number of blue edges of 59) while only 37.9 are colored blue in average when the previous set of weights is used. Moreover, one can also observed that, once the coloration phase is performed, branch and bound procedure BB $_{Y'}$ is as efficient as the resolution by MIP.

5.3. Tests with non-monotonic weights

We present here the results obtained when the weights are non-monotonic. In this subsection, we used Hurwicz’s criterion as OWA operator. We recall that, for a vector y , it is defined as $\alpha \max_i y_i + (1 - \alpha) \min_i y_i$. The instances are defined similarly to the previous subsection, with 3, 4 or 5 objectives, and parameter α varying from 0.4 to 0.6 in Hurwicz’s criterion. As mentioned in Section 3, the MIP formulation is no more valid in this case, as well as the preprocessing procedure (the optimality conditions do not hold anymore). Furthermore, the bound obtained by relaxation of the objective function becomes weak since there does not necessarily exist a normalized set of weights satisfying Constraint 1 (see Section 4.2). Consequently, in the global procedure described in Subsection 5.2, the coloration phase consists of a single run of the shaving procedure with the bound obtained by relaxation of the image set, and the resolution phase consists of applying branch and bound BB $_{Y'}$. Tables 5, 6 and 7 summarize the results obtained. The conventions are the same than in the previous subsection.

In these tables, one can observe that parameter α has a significant impact on the resolution times: it is easier for values of α that are above 0.5. For example, with 3 objectives and $n = 25$, the average execution time is 5.09 seconds for $\alpha = 0.6$, while it is 195.6 seconds for $\alpha = 0.5$, and it is more than 30 minutes for $\alpha = 0.4$. The sizes of the

	n	5	10	15	20	25
$\alpha = 0.4$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (1.5 - 3.23)	0 (0.13 - 12.53)	0.02 (0 - 4)	0.04 (0 - 2.73)	- -
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.02	0.05 0 - 0.77	1.01 0.05 - 6.18	37.93 0.85 - 129.7	- -
$\alpha = 0.5$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (1.72 - 3.22)	0 (0.07 - 10.83)	0.02 (0.03 - 18.5)	0.04 (0 - 15.27)	0.07 (0 - 12.57)
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.03	0.03 0 - 0.14	0.87 0.06 - 9.93	7.53 0.23 - 40.46	195.6 2.14 - 2203.1
$\alpha = 0.6$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (1.73 - 3.3)	0.01 (1.9 - 23.2)	0.01 (0.8 - 48.07)	0.03 (0.23 - 82.1)	0.06 (0 - 100.5)
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.01	0.01 0 - 0.04	0.11 0.01 - 0.66	0.66 0.07 - 3.02	5.09 0.19 - 23.68

Table 5: Synthesis of the numerical results for 3 objectives. Execution times are indicated in seconds. Symbol “-” means that the average execution time exceeds 30 minutes.

	n	5	10	15	20	25
$\alpha = 0.4$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (0.9 - 2.6)	0.01 (0 - 2.67)	0.02 (0 - 4.33)	- -	- -
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.02	0.21 0.02 - 0.57	10.31 0.21 - 82.37	- -	- -
$\alpha = 0.5$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (0.63 - 2.03)	0.01 (0 - 4.53)	0.02 (0 - 4.9)	0.05 (0 - 0.47)	- -
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.02	0.12 0.01 - 0.72	6.03 0.22 - 63.63	669.09 10.84 - 8779.1	- -
$\alpha = 0.6$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (1.17 - 2.33)	0.01 (0.07 - 7.8)	0.02 (0 - 8.07)	0.05 (0 - 3.1)	0.09 (0 - 2.7)
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.03	0.11 0.01 - 0.32	1.66 0.16 - 4.65	84.87 6.15 - 760.5	886.8 12.46 - 5198.1

Table 6: Synthesis of the numerical results for 4 objectives. Execution times are indicated in seconds. Symbol “-” means that the average execution time exceeds 30 minutes.

tackled instances are more modest than for strictly decreasing weights. The only available alternative method should be however to resort to an exhaustive enumeration procedure [16], that would become intractable for 12 vertices. The results presented here are therefore a first step towards optimizing non-convex aggregation functions in multiobjective spanning tree problems. They make it possible to handle instances the size of which grows up to 25 vertices.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have proposed several methods to solve the OWA-optimal spanning tree problem. One is based on a MIP formulation and is valid only when the weights of the OWA operator are strictly decreasing. We have shown that the use of a preprocessing phase, as well as a shaving procedure, makes it possible to considerably reduce the size of the problem, and therefore speed up the resolution. The numerical results prove the efficiency of the global resolution procedure (one is able to solve multiobjective instances with up to 100 vertices in reasonable times). Two branch and bound algorithms have also been presented, that work whatever weights are used. Despite a greater resolution time in the strictly decreasing case, they make it possible to tackle the non-monotonic case. This is a very challenging task, and the numerical results presented here are a first step in this direction. For future works, it would be worth further investigating optimization of OWA in this case, as well as some interesting variations of OWA, namely the non-monotonic OWA operator [42] (where negative weights are allowed) and the weighted OWA

	n	5	10	15	20
$\alpha = 0.4$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (0.83 - 2.4)	0.01 (0.03 - 2.27)	0.02 (0 - 1.17)	- -
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0 0 - 0.02	0.45 0.01 - 2.98	40.74 1.4 - 184.8	- -
$\alpha = 0.5$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (0.87 - 1.93)	0.01 (0 - 1.6)	0.02 (0 - 0.1)	0.06 (0 - 0)
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0.01 0 - 0.02	0.72 0.05 - 4.45	47.93 1.27 - 528.6	1674.9 139 - 8378.1
$\alpha = 0.6$	$sh_{Y'}$	0 (0.47 - 1.2)	0.01 (0 - 1.47)	0.04 (0 - 1.4)	0.05 (0 - 0)
	$sh_{Y'} + BB_{Y'}$	0.01 0 - 0.03	0.87 0.1 - 3.96	40.12 0.2 - 267	760.9 29.61 - 3611.1

Table 7: Synthesis of the numerical results for 5 objectives. Execution times are indicated in seconds. Symbol “-” means that the average execution time exceeds 30 minutes.

operator [38] (where importance weights specific to each objective are allowed in addition to the weights of the OWA operator). Other promising research direction would be to propose a MIP formulation for a broader subclass of Choquet integrals (enabling to take into account positive and negative interactions between objectives), as for instance the class of k -additive Choquet integrals [13]. These research tracks are especially important because the search for a single best compromise solution is nearly the only operational approach when there are more than three objectives and the problem does not fit into the dynamic programming framework.

References

- [1] H. Aissi, C. Bazgan, and D. Vanderpooten. Approximation of min-max and min-max regret versions of some combinatorial optimization problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 179(2):281–290, 2007.
- [2] H. Aissi, C. Bazgan, and D. Vanderpooten. Min-max and min-max regret versions of combinatorial optimization problems: A survey. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 197(2):427–438, 2009.
- [3] K.A. Andersen, K. Jörnsten, and M. Lind. On bicriterion minimal spanning trees: An approximation. *Computers & Operations Research*, 23(12):1171–1182, 1996.
- [4] M. Ehrgott. *Multicriteria Optimization, second edition*. Springer, 2005.
- [5] M. Ehrgott and X. Gandibleux. A survey and annotated bibliography of multiobjective combinatorial optimization. *OR Spektrum*, 22:425–460, 2000.
- [6] M. Ehrgott and X. Gandibleux. Approximative solution methods for multiobjective combinatorial optimization. *Journal of the Spanish Statistical and Operations Research Society*, 12(1):1–88, 2004.
- [7] J. Fodor, J.-L. Marichal, and M. Roubens. Characterization of the ordered weighted averaging operators. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 3(2):236–240, 1995.
- [8] L. Galand and P. Perny. Search for Choquet-optimal paths under uncertainty. In *Proceedings of the 23rd conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 125–132, Vancouver, Canada, 7 2007. AAAI Press.
- [9] L. Galand, P. Perny, and O. Spanjaard. A branch and bound algorithm for Choquet optimization in multicriteria problems. In Theodor J. Stewart Jyrki Wallenius Matthias Ehrgott, Boris Naujoks, editor, *Multiple Criteria Decision Making for Sustainable Energy and Transportation Systems*, volume 634 of *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems*, 2009.
- [10] L. Galand and O. Spanjaard. Deux approches complémentaires pour un problème d’arbre couvrant robuste. In *8ème Congrès de la Société Française de Recherche Opérationnelle et d’Aide la Décision*, pages 129–137. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 2007.
- [11] L. Galand and O. Spanjaard. OWA-based search in state space graphs with multiple cost functions. In *20th International Florida Artificial Intelligence Research Society Conference*, pages 86–91. AAAI Press, 2007.
- [12] M. Grabisch. The application of fuzzy integrals in multicriteria decision making. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 89(3):445–456, 1996.
- [13] M. Grabisch. k -order additive discrete fuzzy measures and their representation. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 92:167–189, 1997.
- [14] H.W. Hamacher and G. Ruhe. On spanning tree problems with multiple objectives. *Annals of Operations Research*, 52:209–230, 1994.
- [15] P. Hansen. Bicriterion path problems. In G. Fandel and T. Gal, editors, *Multicriteria Decision Making*, 1980.
- [16] Sanjiv Kapoor and H. Ramesh. Algorithms for enumerating all spanning trees of undirected and weighted graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24(2):247–265, 1995.
- [17] F. Kappel and A.V. Kuntsevich. An implementation of Shor’s r -algorithm. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 15:193–205, 2000.
- [18] N. Katoh, T. Ibaraki, and H. Mine. An algorithm for finding k minimum spanning trees. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(2):247–255, 1981.

- [19] P. Kouvelis and G. Yu. *Robust discrete optimization and its applications*. Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1997.
- [20] T.L. Magnanti and L. Wolsey. *Optimal trees*, volume 7, pages 503–615. North-Holland, 1995.
- [21] P.D. Martin and D.B. Shmoys. A new approach to computing optimal schedules for the job shop scheduling problem. In S.T. McCormick W.H. Curnigham and M. Queyranne, editors, *Proceedings fifth international IPCO conference, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 389–403. LNCS 1084, 1996.
- [22] H. Moulin. *Axioms of Cooperative Decision Making*. Cambridge Books. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [23] W. Ogryczak. Inequality measures and equitable approaches to location problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 122(2):374–391, 2000.
- [24] W. Ogryczak. On efficient WOWA optimization for decision support under risk. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 50:915–928, 2009.
- [25] W. Ogryczak and T. Sliwinski. On solving linear programs with the ordered weighted averaging objective. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 148(1):80–91, 2003.
- [26] C. H. Papadimitriou and M. Yannakakis. On the approximability of trade-offs and optimal access of web sources. In *Proceedings of the 41th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 86–92, 2000.
- [27] P. Perny and O. Spanjaard. An axiomatic approach to robustness in search problems with multiple scenarios. In *19th UAI*, pages 469–476, 2003.
- [28] P. Perny, O. Spanjaard, and L.-X. Storme. A decision-theoretic approach to robust optimization in multivalued graphs. *Annals of Operations Research*, 147(1):317–341, 2006.
- [29] A.P. Punnen and Y. P. Aneja. Minmax combinatorial optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 81(3):634–643, 1995.
- [30] R. M. Ramos, S. Alonso, J. Sicilia, and C. Gonzalez. The problem of the optimal biobjective spanning tree. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 111(3):617–628, 1998.
- [31] E.E. Rosinger. Beyond preference information based multiple criteria decision making. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 53(2):217–227, 1991.
- [32] D. Schmeidler. Integral representation without additivity. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 97(2):255–261, 1986.
- [33] D. Schmeidler. Subjective probability and expected utility without additivity. *Econometrica*, 57:571–587, 1989.
- [34] N.Z. Shor. *Minimization methods for non-differentiable functions*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
- [35] F. Sourd and O. Spanjaard. A multi-objective branch-and-bound framework. Application to the bi-objective spanning tree problem. *INFORMS Journal of Computing*, 20(3):472–484, 2008.
- [36] S. Steiner and T. Radzik. Computing all efficient solutions of the biobjective minimum spanning tree problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 35(1):198–211, 2008.
- [37] R.E. Tarjan. *Data structures and network algorithms*. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 1983.
- [38] V. Torra. The weighted OWA operator. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 12:153–166, 1997.
- [39] A. Warburton. Worst case analysis of greedy and related heuristics for some min-max combinatorial optimization problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 33:234–241, 1985.
- [40] A.P. Wierzbicki. The use of reference objectives in multiobjective optimization. In G. Fandel and T. Gal, editors, *Multiple Criteria Decision Making – Theory and application*. Springer, 1980.
- [41] R.R. Yager. On ordered weighted averaging aggregation operators in multicriteria decision making. In *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, volume 18, pages 183–190, 1988.
- [42] R.R. Yager. Nonmonotonic OWA operators. *Soft Computing*, 3(3):187–196, 1999.
- [43] H. Yaman, O.E. Karaşan, and M.Ç. Pinar. The robust spanning tree problem with interval data. *Operations Research Letters*, 29:31–40, 2001.
- [44] G. Yu. Min-max optimization of several classical discrete optimization problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 98(1):221–242, 1998.